

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AIKEN DIVISION

Tyrone Johnson,)	
)	Civil Case No. 1:22-3840-HMH-SVH
Petitioner,)	
)	
vs.)	OPINION & ORDER
)	
David P. White,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.¹ Tyrone Johnson (“Johnson”), a federal prisoner proceeding pro se, seeks habeas corpus relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. (§ 2241 Pet., generally, ECF No. 1.) In her Report and Recommendation filed on November 7, 2022, Magistrate Judge Hodges recommends that case be transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois. Johnson is housed at the Federal Correctional Institution in Pekin, Illinois, a facility of the Federal Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”).

¹ The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Johnson filed timely objections to the Report and Recommendation. (Objs., ECF No. 9.) Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that Johnson's objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the Report and Recommendation, or merely restate his claims. Accordingly, after review, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Hodges' Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference.

It is therefore

ORDERED that this case is transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
December 1, 2022